Vigiliae Christianae 33, 260–286; © *North-Holland Publishing Company* 1979

THE AUTHENTIKOS LOGOS: A NEW DOCUMENT OF CHRISTIAN PLATONISM

BY

R. VAN DEN BROEK

The *Authentikos Logos* is the third treatise of Codex VI of the Nag Hammadi Library (pp. 22–35). By now, it is known through a facsimile edition and two critical editions of the Coptic text, an English, a French and two German translations, and a commentary.[1] It contains, in the words of G. W. MacRae, "an exposition of the origin, condition and ultimate bliss of the soul."[2] Among the scholars who have studied this text there is a general consensus that it does not show typically Jewish or Christian features and that it is a Gnostic writing or at least presupposes certain general Gnostic ideas.[3] Moreover, it has been said that it has very little in common with the treatises on the soul of Christians such as Tertullian or pagans such as Porphyry and Iamblichus, the principle difference being that it is "almost totally non-philosophical in its style of thought and even in its terminology."[4]

The present article first aims to show that the *Authentikos Logos* presents a doctrine of the soul which is not Gnostic but thoroughly Platonic, in particular in its terminology, and, second, that its author and the people to whom he addressed his work knew the New Testament and were Christians.

I. PLATONIC ELEMENTS

1. *Rational soul – spiritual soul – material soul*

The *Authentikos Logos* presupposes a coherent doctrine of the soul of which the following elements are mentioned. The soul which comes from the "invisible and ineffable worlds" is called "the invisible soul of justice (*tpsychè ñahoratos ñte tdikaiosynè*)" (22,11–15). Even when the soul is in the descent (*tkatabasis*) it is not separated from these worlds "but they see it and it comtemplates them through the invisible Logos (*plogos ñahoratos*)" (22,18–22). The incarnation of the soul is compared with the

marriage of a man and a woman who both have children. The children of the man call those of the woman "our brothers" but, in fact, they are not brothers at all: "In this very way, the spiritual soul (*tpsychè mpneumatikè*), when it was cast into the body, became a sister[5] of desire (*tepithymia*), hatred and envy, and a material soul (*psychè nhylikè*). So therefore, the body came from desire (*tepithymia*) and the desire (*tepithymia*) came from the material substance (*tousia nhylikè*). For this reason the soul (*tpsychè*) became a sister of them" (23,1–22). The soul which has left knowledge behind has fallen into bestiality (24,20–24). But "the rational soul (*tpsychè nlogikè*) which wearied itself in seeking has received knowledge of God" (34,30–35,2). In finding this knowledge the soul is helped by the Logos, which is secretly given to the soul by its bridegroom (*pesnymphios*): "He presented it to its mouth, to make it eat it like food, and he put the Logos (*plogos*) upon its eyes as a medicament to make it see with its mind (*pesnous*) and know its kinsmen (*nessyggenès*) and receive knowledge about its root" (22,22–30). The Adversary spreads out before the body all kinds of passions and pleasures of the flesh in order to make the mind of the soul (*hèt ntpsychè*) incline towards them (31,8–14). But the soul which has realized that sweet passions are transitory, enters into a new conduct (*politeia*), strips off the world, "while its true garment clothes it within and its bridal clothing is placed upon it in beauty of mind (*hèt*), not in fleshly pride" (31,24–32,8). The evil forces which, "wishing to strike down the invisible soul (*tpsychè nahoratos*)", had shaped the body of this soul "did not realize that it has an invisible spiritual body (*ousôma mpneumatikon nahoraton*)" (32,24–32). Knowledge of its origin and a life in continence are the indispensable conditions for the soul's ascent to the world of God: "We have nothing in this world, lest the authority of the world that has come into being (*texousia mpkosmos entasshôpe*) should detain us in the worlds that are in the heavens, those in which universal death exists, surrounded by the individual ... [following lines missing]" (26,26–33).

For a correct understanding of the *Authentikos Logos* it should be realized that the terms "spiritual soul" and "rational soul" do not refer to the same psychic entity but that the ψυχὴ πνευματική serves as a body to the ψυχὴ λογική and, therefore, has to be identified with the σῶμα πνευματικόν.

The distinction between the "spiritual" and the "rational" soul is well-known from Porphyry's *De regressu animae* of which fragments have

been preserved in Book X of St. Augustine's *De Civitate Dei*.[6] In this work Porphyry argued that not only the *anima rationalis* (= ψυχὴ λογική), which he preferred to call the *anima intellectualis* (= ψυχὴ νοερά), but also the *anima spiritalis* (= ψυχὴ πνευματική) could be saved from the material world. The *anima rationalis* or *intellectualis* is the higher part of the soul "by which it perceives the truth of the intelligible realities which have no resemblance to material substances (... *parti animae ... intellectuali, qua rerum intellegibilium percipitur veritas, nullas habentium similitudines corporum*)." The *anima spiritalis* is the lower part of the soul "by which the images of material things are apprehended (... *spiritali qua corporalium rerum capiuntur imagines*)."[7]

In Augustine's references to *De regressu animae* there is nothing which suggests that Porphyry took the "spiritual" soul to be the body of the "rational" soul. Possibly, he used the term "spiritual soul" only in this work in which he seems to have primarily spoken as, in the words of Dörrie, "the creator of a doctrine of salvation, even a science of salvation."[8] In an earlier, more theoretical work like the *Sententiae* the intermediary between soul and matter is not called ἡ πνευματικὴ ψυχή but τὸ πνεῦμα.[9] Synesius of Cyrene, in his *De insomniis*, 4–10 (134A–142D; Terzaghi 149–165), speaks about the πνεῦμα in much the same way as Porphyry did in his *Sententiae*.[10] He distinguishes between the νοῦς, which he calls "the first soul" (4, 134B, Terzaghi 150,10), and the imagination (φαντασία) which, as a kind of second soul, expresses itself as πνεῦμα or πνεῦμα ψυχικόν, "which the happy have also called the spiritual soul (7, 137D, Terzaghi 156,8: ὃ καὶ πνευματικὴν ψυχὴν προσηγόρευσαν οἱ εὐδαίμονες)." By "the happy" he seems to mean some illuminated philosophers, like Porphyry. It is conceivable that Porphyry in his other works avoided speaking about the lower part of the individual soul as the ψυχὴ πνευματική and preferred the term πνεῦμα in order to prevent the impression that the soul καθ' ἑαυτὴν did not wholly participate in the νοητὴ ουσία.[11]

That the term ψυχὴ πνευματική was deliberately avoided is clearly shown by Hierocles of Alexandria, who was strongly influenced by Porphyry.[12] In his *Commentarius in Aureum Pythagoreorum Carmen*, 26,2 (Koehler 111,12), he says that man is a ψυχὴ λογικὴ μετὰ συμφυοῦς ἀθανάτου σώματος. Real man consists of rational substance and an immaterial body, of which our mortal living being, consisting of irrational life and a material body, is only an image (26,5 Koehler 112,14–17). The immaterial body of the soul, which gives life to the material body, is

called by Hierocles τὸ συμφυὲς πνεῦμα τῆς ψυχῆς,[13] τὸ πνευματικὸν ὄχημα τῆς λογικῆς ψυχῆς, τὸ συμφυὲς ἀθανατὸν σῶμα, τὸ ζωτικὸν σῶμα, τὸ ἄϋλον σῶμα, τὸ αὐγοειδὲς σῶμα, and τὸ ψυχικὸν σῶμα. But he never speaks about the vehicle of the rational soul as the ψυχὴ πνευματική, as was still done by Porphyry in *De regressu animae* and the author of the *Authentikos Logos*.

According to Porphyry, the individual soul collects the pneuma during its descent through the spheres, *Sent.*, 29 (Lambertz 18,6): τὸ πνεῦμα ..., ὃ ἐκ τῶν σφαιρῶν συνελέξατο.[14] In his *Commentarii in Somnium Scipionis*, 1,11,12–12,18, Macrobius presents a description of the descent of the soul of which Porphyry is generally accepted to be the source.[15] In the course of its descent the soul swells "*in quaedam siderei corporis incrementa*": in each sphere it is clothed with an etherial envelope. In this way it is gradually accustomed to union with our earthly body and, therefore, to as many deaths as the spheres through which it passes. Finally it reaches that state which on earth is called life.[16] The view that the celestial spheres are characterized by death is also expressed by the *Authentikos Logos* when it states that the soul can be detained in "the worlds that are in the heavens, those in which universal death exists" (26,29–32).

In Macrobius' report (1,12,13 Willis II,50,13–15) it is said that in the course of its descent through the spheres the soul is not only wrapped in an increasing luminous body ("*luminosi corporis amicitur accessu*", cf. the *sidereum corpus* mentioned above) but also acquires the psychic and vital faculties (*motus*) which are necessary for its earthly existence. Macrobius suggests a distinction between the astral body and the envelopes of the soul ("*non solum ... sed et*"). In fact, we are concerned here with two closely related but originally not identical conceptions which, however, became inextricably entangled.[17]

According to Macrobius, the *motus* which the soul receives from the planetary spheres are the following: τὸ λογιστικόν or θεωρητικόν (Saturnus), τὸ πρακτικόν (Iuppiter), τὸ θυμικόν (Mars), τὸ αἰσθητικόν or φανταστικόν (Sol), τὸ ἐπιθυμητικόν (Venus), τὸ ἑρμηνευτικόν (Mercurius), τὸ φυτικόν (Luna).[18] This is a philosophical interpretation of an originally mythical conception according to which the planetary spheres are governed by evil spirits which endow the descending souls with all kinds of vices. This view is in particular found in several Gnostic systems.[19] It forms the background of the view that death reigns in the planetary spheres. In Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.*, I,29, (Harvey I, 226) the seven rulers of these spheres are given as Protarchon, Authadia, Kakia, Zelos,

Phthonus, Erinnys, and Epithymia. The idea is that the rulers of the planets are responsible for the passions in man. In the *Authentikos Logos*, 23,13–16, it is said that when the soul was cast into the body it became a sister of desire (ἐπιθυμία), hatred (*moste* = μῖσος) and envy (*kôh* = φθόνος). These passions are strongly reminiscent of the last three passions mentioned by Irenaeus. The words ἐρινύς and μῖσος are not synonyms, but the difference is slight enough to suggest that the three passions mentioned in the *Authentikos Logos* originally were part of an enumeration of planetary vices which the soul takes on during its descent.

Becoming a sister of desire, hatred and envy the soul became a ψυχὴ ὑλική (23,16–17). The existence of a ψυχὴ ὑλική, which is called ἄλογος καὶ τῇ τῶν θηρίων ὁμοούσιος, was assumed by Theodotus the Gnostic, as is shown by Clement of Alexandria's *Excerpta*, 50 ff. (Sagnard 162 ff.). It is the κατ' εἰκόνα ἄνθρωπος of Gen. 1,26, made of a τῆς πολυμεροῦς καὶ ποικίλης ὕλης μέρος. This soul serves as body for the καθ' ὁμοίωσιν ἄνθρωπος of Gen. 1,26, which is said to be a ψυχὴ θεία ὁμοούσιος to the Demiurge. This divine soul is also called ἡ λογικὴ καὶ οὐρανία ψυχή (*Exc.*, 53,5 Sagn. 168); in fact it is the "psychic" soul, though this term is avoided. In this soul Sophia sowed τὸ σπέρμα τὸ πνευματικόν which formed the "pneumatic man". In Clement's *Excerpta*, Theodotus does not use the term "pneumatic soul", but it will be clear that his anthropology is based upon the distinction between ψυχὴ λογική, ψυχὴ πνευματική, and ψυχὴ ὑλική which we find in the *Authentikos Logos*. This implies that these terms were already known in the second century A.D. and that Porphyry's distinction between the *anima rationalis* and the *anima spiritalis* derives from an older source. For the Gnostic teacher Theodotus the pneumatic element is the highest, most divine aspect of man. For the author of the *Authentikos Logos*, as for Porphyry and his followers, the pneumatic soul is subordinate to the rational soul. This difference shows that in the *Authentikos Logos* the terminology concerning the soul is not Gnostic but Platonic. From the evidence of Theodotus we may conclude that the "telescoping" structure of the psychic part of man was characteristic of this doctrine from the beginning.[20]

In the *Authentikos Logos* the passions are constitutive for the ψυχὴ ὑλική; they come from the οὐσία ὑλική. These views are strongly reminiscent of those of Numenius. This Neopythagorean Platonist taught two World Souls: "*duas mundi animas ..., unam malignam ex silva, alteram benificam ex Deo*" (Calcidius, *Comm. in Tim.*, 300, Waszink 302,5–6).[21] In the same manner he attributed τὸ λογικόν and τὸ ἄλογον in man to two

different and opposite souls, of which one, the rational soul, came from God and the other, the irrational soul, came from matter.[22] Matter is the source of all evil[23] and from that source the passions are attached to the rational soul; they are ἔξωθεν προσφυόμενα.[24] In this irrational soul there is "something corporeal and mortal and similar to a body." It is characterized by *ira* and *cupiditas*.[25]

A similar view was taught in the school of Basilides the Gnostic. According to Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.*, 2,112 (Stählin II, 174) the Basilidians called the passions προσαρτήματα of the soul and interpreted them as certain spirits which were attached to the rational soul (πνεύματά τινα ... προσηρτημένα τῇ λογικῇ ψυχῇ). Basilides' son, Isidorus, even wrote a book significantly entitled Περὶ προσφυοῦς ψυχῆς, in which he, "like the Pythagoreans" as Clement observes, adopted the view that man has two souls (*Strom.*, 2,113,3–114,2, Stählin II,174). It seems not too bold to assume that the psychology of Basilides and Isidorus was influenced by the views of Numenius.[26]

In the *Authentikos Logos* the ψυχὴ πνευματική is said to become a ψυχὴ ὑλική. The Coptic does not allow to take the text as saying that in becoming a sister of desire, hatred and envy the spiritual soul became a sister of the material soul.[27] But we may be sure that it was this which the author meant to say, for the whole context presents a distinctly dualistic view. The soul comes from the Father and the passions from the Mother. When they are joined together the passions cannot inherit from the Father but only from their mother. To this we may compare the Numenian view in Calcidius, *Comm. in Tim.*, 298 (Waszink 300,4–5), where it is said that "according to Plato", the world received its good things from the magnificence of God as a father; evil clung to it through the evilness of matter, its mother ("*mundo bona sua dei tamquam patris liberalitate collata sunt, mala vero matris siluae vitio cohaeserunt*").[28]

In addition to its mention of the material soul, the *Authentikos Logos* explicitly states that matter is the origin of evil for the soul: "So therefore, the body came from the ἐπιθυμία and the ἐπιθυμία came from the οὐσία ὑλική" (23,17–21). Among the Platonists, Numenius and his pupil Cronius are singled out by Iamblichus as philosophers who taught that evil comes to the soul from matter, whereas Harpocration sometimes said that it comes from the bodies themselves and Plotinus and Porphyry mostly assumed that it comes from nature and the irrational soul.[29] The last mentioned opinion comes close to that of Numenius but does not imply a dualistic view of the world and man. In the Platonic discussions

on the origin of the evil of the soul the *Authentikos Logos* takes position on the side of Numenius: the ἐπιθυμία in the soul does not come from the body but from the οὐσία ὑλική. Was it Numenius who first distinguished between the rational, the spiritual and the material soul?

2. *The earthly struggle and the ascent of the soul*

During its earthly existence the soul has to fight a continuous struggle against the allurements of the material world. The pleasures of this world are described as various kinds of bait, in which the fisherman, the devil, has hidden his hook in order to catch the fish, the soul, and deliver it to perdition (29,23–31,24). This simile has been said to be unique,[30] but the only thing which is singular in it is its very elaborate form. It is a not uncommon expansion of one of Plato's most popular expressions, viz. that lust is the greatest bait of evil (*Tim.*, 69d Burnet: ... ἡδονήν, μέγιστον κακοῦ δέλεαρ). Recently, this expression has been thoroughly studied by Pierre Courcelle.[31] Among the evidence discussed by Courcelle there are two texts which also include the catching of fish in the simile. Cicero, in his *De senectute*, 13,44 (Falconer 54), with an explicit reference to Plato, says that men are caught by lust as fishes: "*divine enim Plato 'escam malorum' appellat voluptatem, quod ea videlicet homines capiantur ut pisces.*" Basil the Great, in his *Regulae fusius tractatae*, 17,2 (PG 31,964B) quotes Plato literally and adds that through ἡδονή every soul is drawn to death as by a hook (ὑφ' ἧς πᾶσα ψυχὴ ὡς ὑπ' ἀγκίστρου πρὸς τὸν θάνατον ἕλκεται). Most probably, it was not on their own accord that Cicero and Basil expanded Plato's simile with the catching of fish by the hook hidden in the bait. This expansion must have taken place somewhere in the Platonic tradition before Cicero. It seems to have been more common than the two texts afforded by Courcelle suggest. This is not only shown by the *Authentikos Logos* but also by Clement of Alexandria who in his *Paedagogus*, 3,31,3 (Stählin 1,254) says of luxuriously living women that with their luxury as with bait they hook the miserable men who gape at the gold glitter in their bathrooms: τούτῳ καθάπερ δελέατι ἀγκιστρεύουσιν τοὺς ἀθλίους κεχηνότας ἐπὶ τὰς μαρμαρυγὰς τοῦ χρυσίου.

According to the *Authentikos Logos* the soul can only be saved from the world of matter through knowledge and continence. It is inevitable that the soul tastes the pleasures offered by the passions: "But the soul that has tasted from them has realized that they are passions that are transitory. It has learned their κακία, it has turned away from them and entered into a new πολιτεία. Afterward it despises this life because it is transitory.

And it looks for those foods that will take it into life and leaves behind it these deceitful foods" (31,24–32,1). The author says: "We go about in hunger and in thirst, looking toward our dwelling place, the place which our πολιτεία and συνείδησις look toward, not clinging to the things which have come into being, but withdrawing from them. Our hearts are set on the things that exist, though we are ill, feeble and in pain" (27,14–23).

These views have to be compared with those of Porphyry in *De regressu animae*. According to St. Augustine, *De Civ.*, 10,30 (frg. 11,1 Bidez), Porphyry said "that God has put the soul into the world for this purpose that the soul might realize the evils of the material world and so hurry back to the Father, and never again be held back by the polluting contact of such evils."[32] The *Authentikos Logos* and Porphyry have in common that realization of the evil character of the material world is the first step to salvation.

Porphyry distinguished between the liberation of the spiritual soul and that of the rational soul. His views on the purification of the spiritual soul seem to have been hesitating. On the one hand, he said that this lower part of the soul could be saved by theurgic rites. But that would not assure the soul's immortality and eternity (*De Civ.*, 10,9, frg. 2 Bidez). Purified by theurgic art, the spiritual souls cannot return to the Father but will have their dwelling place among the gods of ether, above the levels of the air (*De Civ.*, 10,27, frg. 3 and 4 Bidez).[33] On the other hand, Porphyry said that the spiritual soul could be purified by continence, without theurgic arts and initiations: "*Confiteris tamen etiam spiritalem animam sine theurgicis artibus et sine teletis ... posse continentiae virtute purgari*" (*De Civ.*, 10,28, frg. 7 Bidez).

For the salvation of the rational or intellectual soul, however, Porphyry considered theurgic rites of no value. He was convinced that the rational soul could escape into its own realm ("*in sua posse evadere*"), even without theurgic purification of the spiritual part (*De Civ.*, 10,9, frg. 2 Bidez). The rational soul can return to God by virtue of its intelligence ("*per virtutem intelligentiae*"), but this is a grace which is granted to few people only (*De Civ.*, 10,29, frg. 10 Bidez).

Thus Saint Augustine makes it perfectly clear that, according to Porphyry, the soul of a truly philosophical man could be purified from all material pollution: his spiritual soul could be elevated into the etherial world *continentiae virtute* and his rational soul could return to the Father for ever *per virtutem intelligentiae*.

The same view was expressed by the *Novi viri* of Arnobius, who took it

for granted that they would return to the Lord's palace ("*in aulam dominicam*") as to their own home ("*in propriam sedem*"; cf. Porphyry's *in sua*) without anyone to stop them ("*nullo prohibente*"). It seems certain that the *Novi viri* represent the views of Porphyry.[34])

In the *Authentikos Logos* the unimpeded ascent is also the purpose of the soul's continence on earth: "We have nothing in this world, lest the authority of the world that has come into being should not detain us in the worlds that are in the heavens, those in which universal death exists" (26,26–32). As in Arnobius, the soul's destination is called "its αὐλή", which, however, is taken in the sense of "fold": when the soul has received knowledge of its depth "it hastens into its αὐλή, while its shepherd stands at the door" (29,9–11). The evil forces which are responsible for the soul's mortal body do not know that the (rational) soul has an invisible spiritual body, i.e. the spiritual soul within the material soul, and that it knows another way which its true shepherd taught it in knowledge (32,30–33,3).

In the *Authentikos Logos*, the possession of knowledge is indispensable for the soul's return to the Father, as it is in Porphyry. "We are victorious over their (*sc.* the adversaries') ignorance through our knowledge, since we already have known the Untraceable One from whom we have come forth" (26,22–26). "The rational soul which wearied itself in seeking received knowledge of God" (34,32–35,2). But in order to acquire this knowledge the soul needs divine help. Its νυμφίος, a term which seems to indicate the divine Νοῦς, secretly gives the Logos to the soul: "He presented it to its mouth, to make it eat it like food, and he put the Logos upon its eyes as a medicament to make it see with its νοῦς and know its συγγενεῖς and receive knowledge about its root" (22,22–30). The Logos is for the soul a food of life just as the baits of the passions are a food of death. The idea that the Logos is a medicament which makes the soul's eyes see presupposes, of course, the Platonic commonplace of the νοῦς as the eye of the soul.[35] The same idea is expressed in 27,24–33: "There is a great strength hidden within us (viz. the Logos). Our soul indeed is ill, because it dwells in a house of poverty, while matter wounds its eyes wishing to make it blind. For this reason it hastens to the Logos and puts it on its eyes as a medicament which opens them." The soul which has come from the Father into the hostile world of matter would fall into ignorance if the divine Νοῦς would not work upon its own νοῦς through the Logos.

The idea that the human mind and reason are indispensable but insufficient for the soul's liberation from the bonds of matter and that,

therefore, the aid of the divine Mind and Reason is needed is also found in the *Teachings of Silvanus*, NH Cod. VII,86,13–23: "Entrust yourself to this pair of friends, reason and mind, and no one will be victorious over you. May God dwell in your camp, may his Spirit protect your gates, and may the Mind of divinity protect the walls. Let holy Reason become a torch in your mind, burning the wood which is the entirety of sin."[36] But also Porphyry presents a parallel conception. According to him, ignorance, which is a disease of the rational soul, and the faults to which it gives rise could not be purified by any initiatory rites but only by the Mind of the Father: "*Ignorantiam certe et propter eam multa vitia per nullas teletas purgari dicis, sed per solum* πατρικὸν νοῦν, *id est paternam mentem sive intellectum, qui paternae est conscius voluntatis*" (Augustine, *De Civ.*, 10,28, frg. 7 Bidez). Porphyry said that those who had lived *secundum intellectum* in the hereafter, by the *providentia dei et gratia*, would receive the complete purification which they could not attain on earth (*De Civ.*, 10,29, frg. 10 Bidez). Augustine observes that Porphyry speaks of "grace" and of the purifying activity of "the Father's Mind" but that he refuses to accept that the πατρικὸς νοῦς is Christ who bestows his grace on men. The reason for this can only be, according to Augustine, that Christ is humble and Porphyry proud.

3. *The will of the Father*

On page 25,26 the *Authentikos Logos* starts a new section in which the themes of the preceding part of the treatise return in a more elaborate form. The beginning of this second part reads as follows: "And before anything came into being it was the Father alone who existed, before the worlds which are in the heavens appeared or the world which is on earth, or principality, or authority, or the powers ... [lacuna of ca. 50 letters] ... appear ... [ca. 10 letters missing] ... and ... [ca. 14 letters missing] ... For nothing has come into being without his will" (25,26–26,7).

The first part of the treatise also opens by saying that the Invisible Father rested alone in heaven "before anything appeared of the hidden and the visible heavens and before the invisible, ineffable worlds from which the invisible soul of justice came forth were revealed" (22,1–15). The beginning of the second part explicitly mentions "the world which is on earth" and adds the ἀρχαί, ἐξουσίαι, and δυνάμεις. It should be noticed that these heavenly forces are mentioned in the same sequence by by St. Paul in 1 Cor. 15,24 and Eph. 1,21, which seems to point to influence of the New Testament.

The author ends the short and unfortunately lacunous exposition of the origin of the world which opens the second part with a general statement: "For nothing has come into being without his will." The creation is due to an act of the will of God. This view does not necessarily exclude the creating activity of a Demiurge, though the text does not mention it. But it certainly excludes the basic Gnostic idea that the origin of the world is due to a deficiency in the Pleroma, a heavenly fall of Sophia or something like that which, against the will of God, entailed the birth of the Demiurge, the creation of the world and man, and the dispersion of the divine sparks in the world of matter.[37]

According to the *Authentikos Logos*, not only the spiritual and material worlds owe their existence to the divine will but also the earthly struggle of the soul is due to the will of God. After the general statement that "nothing has come into being without his will" the text continues: "The Father, then, because he wanted to reveal his wealth and glory, established this great contest (ἀγών) in this world, wishing the champions (ἀγωνιστής) to become manifest and all those who contend to leave behind them the things that have come into being and to despise them with an exalted and incomprehensible knowledge and to hasten to the Existing One (or: that which is)" (26,8–20).

This view implies that the soul's earthly existence is not due to a pre-existent fall which has to be punished in a body; it excludes the idea that some souls are saved by nature and others predestined to perdition. The soul can fall into ignorance and bestiality; it has to struggle against the passions of the material soul, and needs the help of the divine Nous through the illuminating Logos. The non-gnostic character of this doctrine of the soul is in particular shown by the peculiar remark that it is the Father himself who has established the ἀγών between the soul and the material world, because he wanted to reveal his wealth and his glory. This is done when the "champions" become manifest, that is to say when all the contenders leave the created things behind, despise them in an incomprehensible knowledge and hasten to the Existing One (= ὁ ὤν) or that which is (= τὸ ὄν). Thus, through a life in continence and knowledge the soul represents and reveals the Father in the world of matter.

These ideas have a clear parallel in a particular doctrine of the soul which was current in the school of the Athenian Middle Platonist Calvenus (or Calvisius) Taurus (mid-second century A.D.). Iamblichus, in Stobaeus, *Eclog.*, 1,49,39 (Wachsmuth I, 378,25–379,6), reports that among the pupils of this Platonist there existed two views on the purpose of the

soul's descent. These views are not mutually exclusive and, therefore, may both go back to Taurus himself:[38] "The Platonists around Taurus say that the souls are sent by the gods to earth. Some of them, following the Timaeus (41B), teach that this is done for the completion of the universe...; others declare that the purpose of the descent is to demonstrate divine life. For this is the will of the gods, to reveal themselves through the souls. For the gods become manifest and are shown through the pure and immaculate life of the souls (ταύτην γὰρ εἶναι τὴν βούλησιν τῶν θεῶν, θεοὺς ἐκφαίνεσθαι διὰ τῶν ψυχῶν· προέρχονται γὰρ εἰς τοὐμφανὲς οἱ θεοὶ καὶ ἐπιδείκνυνται διὰ τῶν ψυχῶν καθαρᾶς καὶ ἀχράντου ζωῆς).

It will be clear that the second view closely corresponds to that of the *Authentikos Logos*. If we substitute "the Father" for "the gods" Iamblichus' report could be an exact reproduction of the teaching of the *Authentikos Logos*: it is the will of the Father to reveal himself through the soul; this is done when the soul lives a pure and immaculate life. That such a life can only be obtained through a continuous struggle with the passions was undoubtedly also supposed by Taurus and his followers. This view on the purpose of the soul's descent was characteristic of the school of Taurus only.[39] It was so singular that the occurrence of corresponding ideas in the *Authentikos Logos* seems to point to a direct influence of the former on the latter. In any case it shows once again that the *Authentikos Logos* is not Gnostic but thoroughly Platonic.

II. CHRISTIAN ELEMENTS

1. *The New Testament*

The author of the *Authentikos Logos* knew the New Testament and considered it authoritative. However, he does not literally quote it but only alludes to it, mostly in a rather vague manner. This vagueness has led most scholars to deny any *direct* biblical influence on the language of the treatise. In the following, four instances of New Testament influence are discussed, of which the fourth in particular comes very close to a literal quotation.

a. In the preceding discussion of the purpose of the soul's descent and struggle on earth no attention was paid to the way in which the author put his remarkable view into words. He does not say that the Father wanted to reveal himself but that he wished to make known "his wealth and his glory". This seems to reflect the language of St. Paul, who in turn

was under the influence of the Old Testament. There this pair of words (LXX: πλοῦτος καὶ δόξα) is used to indicate a person's material wealth and standing: Gen. 31,16 (of Laban, and Jacob's wives), 1 Kings 3,13 and 1 Chron. 29,28 (of Solomon), Esther 10,2 (of Ahasverus, cf. also 1,4), Prov. 3,16; 8,18; 22,4; and Wisdom of Jes. Sirach 24,17 (gifts of Wisdom to man), Isaiah 16,14 (of Moab), and Psalms of Solomon 1,4 (of the Jews).

Saint Paul shows a certain predelection for these words, mostly in a characteristic genitive construction, when he wants to indicate the fulness of God's revelation in Christ. He speaks of the "wealth of the glory (πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης)" of God (Rom. 9,23; Eph. 3,16), of his share (Eph. 1,18), of his mystery (Col. 1,27), or of the "wealth in glory (πλοῦτος ἐν δόξῃ)" of God (Phil. 4,19). In Rom. 9,23 and Col. 1,27 he says that God wanted, and acted, to make known the wealth of the glory of himself and of Christ, which seems to be echoed in the statement of the *Authentikos Logos* that God wanted to make known his wealth and his glory. The context of Col. 1,27 is of particular interest here since the expression is joined there, as in the *Authentikos Logos*, with the ἀγών motif. Paul says that he is suffering for the sake of the Church, he is its servant with the special task to announce the secret hidden for long ages but now revealed to the saints. It was God's will to make known to them the wealth of the glory of this mystery among the nations, which is Christ. In order that also the Colossians would become mature members of Christ's body Paul is constantly toiling, striving (ἀγωνιζόμενος) with all the energy and power of Christ, and he wants them to know how great his struggle (ἀγών) for them is, in order that they also would grasp the mystery of God, Christ.

Although there is an apparent relationship in terminology there are marked differences between the view of Saint Paul and that of the *Authentikos Logos*. The least of them is that Paul mostly speaks of "the wealth of his glory" and not of "wealth and glory". Both authors speak of the ἀγών in connexion with the will of God to reveal his wealth and glory, but obviously the same words do not cover identical conceptions. Paul sees his personal sufferings and strivings as a corollary of his preaching the Gospel to the Gentiles, whereas the *Authentikos Logos* deals with the struggle of the soul against the pleasures of the flesh and the material world. What the Apostle saw as his personal vocation and destiny has become a general rule for every one who forsakes the body and the world; the missionary aspect of the ἀγών has changed into an ascetic motif; the salvation of the Gentiles has become the salvation of the individual soul. The author of the *Authentikos Logos* seems to have made

use of Pauline terminology in order to baptize a non-Pauline conception. We have seen that this was a doctrine of the soul which was current in the school of Calvenus Taurus.

b. There are other places in the *Authentikos Logos* which show that its author knew the Scriptures. In 33,26, the ignorants who are opposed to those who seek God are called "children of the διάβολος", which recalls the same expression in the New Testament (cf. John 8,44; Acts 13,10; 1 John 3,10). Of these ἀνόητοι it is repeatedly said, in 33,10–11 and 34,12, that they are worse than the pagans. The author uses here the word ἔθνος in its biblical sense of "heathen", "pagan". In 33,25–32, this statement is substantiated in the following way: "Indeed they (sc. the ignorants) are the children of the devil. For the pagans also give charity and they know that God who is in heaven exists, the Father of the All, being exalted over their idols which they worship."

This argument presupposes the comparison found in the Sermon on the Mount (Matth. 5,47; 6,32) between the inadequate believer and the heathen. To greet only one's brothers has nothing extraordinary because the pagans (ἐθνικοί) do the same (Matt. 5,47). The parallel saying in Luke 6,33 speaks about "doing good", which more resembles the "give charity" of the *Authentikos Logos*, but Luke reads "sinners" and not "pagans". On the basis of this comparison the author of our Coptic text goes a step farther. He points out that his opponents are not only no better than pagans, because these give alms as well, but are even worse. For they do not seek God nor his true worship, whereas the pagans know of the existence of the true God who is in heaven, the Father of the All, who is exalted over the idols they worship.

We may note in passing that the author apparently was aware of the existence of a pagan, philosophical view of God as the supreme spiritual Being, whose parts or messengers the other gods were thought to be and whose true worship existed in the elevation of the mind to him without the mediation of the traditional forms of cult, which were only accepted as concessions to the weakness of human nature.[40] This shows once again that the author of the *Authentikos Logos* had a good knowledge of the philosophy of the time.

c. The whole passage which contains the comparison between the "ignorants" and the pagans deals with the theme of the seeking of God (pp. 33 and 34). The lines quoted in the preceding section are continued as follows: "But they did not listen to the word that they should inquire about his ways.[41] Thus the senseless (ἀνόητος) man hears the call but he

is ignorant of the place to which he has been called. And he did not ask during the preaching: 'Where is the temple to which I should go and worship my Hope (ἐλπίς)?' " (34,1–10).

First it should be noticed that the word ἐλπίς as an indication of God reflects the personal language of the Psalms, in the version of the Septuagint: 90,9: σύ, κύριε, ἡ ἐλπίς μου (also 13,6 and 70,5).

In the New Testament there is only one person who during the preaching of Jesus puts a question about the place where God should be worshipped, namely the Samaritan woman of John 4,20. According to Heracleon, in Origen, *Comm. in Ev. John.*, 13,92 (Blanc, SC 222,78–81), the Samaritan woman shows by her question the cause of her prostitution, viz. that she δι' ἄγνοιαν had neglected God and his true worship. She put that question βουλομένη μαθεῖν πῶς καὶ τίνι εὐαρεστήσασα καὶ θεῷ προσκυνήσασα ἀπαλλαγείη τοῦ πορνεύειν (13,94). The ἀνόητος of the *Authentikos Logos* is in the same way ignorant of God and his true worship but, contrary to the Samaritan woman, he does not inquire after the place where he should worship his "Hope".

d. In 28,22–27, it is said of the soul which has overcome its enemies by virtue of the Logos: "While its enemies look at it in shame it hastens into its treasure-house (Copt. *aho* = θησαυρός), where its mind (νοῦς) is, and (into) its store-house (ἀποθήκη) which is secure."

This sentence contains a clear allusion to a well-known variant of Matth. 6,21 (= Luke 12,34). In vss. 19 and 20 Jesus says: "Do not store up for yourselves treasure on earth, where it grows rusty and moth-eaten, and thieves break in to steal it. Store up treasure in heaven, where there is no moth and no rust to spoil it, no thieves to break in and steal" (NEB). Then the canonical text concludes: ὅπου γάρ ἐστιν ὁ θησαυρός σου, ἐκεῖ ἔσται καὶ ἡ καρδία σου. From the second century onwards, several Christian authors testify to the existence of a deviant version of this saying of Jesus which reads νοῦς instead of καρδία and usually shows an inversion of θησαυρός and νοῦς. The only text in which the latter is not found is Justin Martyr, *Apol.*, 1,15,16 (Goodspeed 36): ὅπου γὰρ ὁ θησαυρός ἐστιν, ἐκεῖ καὶ ὁ νοῦς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. The other testimonies all show the inversed version:

Clement of Alexandria, *Quis div. salv.*, 17,1 (Stählin III,170): ὅπου γὰρ ὁ νοῦς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ἐκεῖ καὶ ὁ θησαυρὸς αὐτοῦ. Idem, *Strom.*, 7,77,6 (Stählin III,55): ὅπου γὰρ ὁ νοῦς τινος, φησίν, ἐκεῖ καὶ ὁ θησαυρὸς αὐτοῦ. Idem, *Strom.*, 4,33,5 (Stählin II,263): ὁ δὲ τῷ ὄντι θησαυρὸς ἡμῶν ἔνθα ἡ συγγένεια τοῦ νοῦ. Macarius, *Hom.*, 43,3 (Dörries-Kloster-

mann-Kroeger 286 = Hom., 14,4 Berthold I,162): ὅπου ὁ νοῦς σου, ἐκεῖ καὶ ὁ θησαυρός σου. *Gospel of Mary*, 10,15–16 (Till-Schencke 68): "For where the mind (νοῦς) is, there is the treasure."

The same version is presupposed in the *Sentences of Sextus*, 316 (Chadwick 48): ὅπου σου τὸ φρονοῦν, ἐκεῖ σου τὸ ἀγαθόν,[42] and possibly also in the *Pistis Sophia*, 90 (Schmidt 204,4), where, however, it cannot be decided whether the Coptic word *hèt* translates καρδία or νοῦς. A substitution of ψυχή for νοῦς is found in Pseudo-Shenoute, *On Christian Behaviour* (Kuhn, CSCO 206,44,27–28): "Where your ψυχή will be, there will be your treasure."

We need not enter here into a detailed discussion of the origin of this deviant version of Matth. 6,21.[43] It might be an independent translation of an original Aramaic saying of Jesus, just as in the Great Commandment (Mark 12,30 parr.) the words διάνοια and καρδία represent a double rendering of one Hebrew word, *lebāb*.[44] The mere fact that in all cases but one the word νοῦς in this saying of Jesus is found in combination with the inversion of θησαυρός and νοῦς points to a fixed, literary tradition. It is inconceivable that as different authors as Clement of Alexandria and Macarius should have independently introduced both the substitution of νοῦς and the inversion.

In view of the evidence presented above there can be no doubt that the *Authentikos Logos* in 28,22–27 contains a distinct allusion to the saying of Matth. 6,21. That the author had the whole passage of Matth. 6,19–20 in mind is shown by his remark that the soul's ἀποθήκη in heaven is "secure" or "safe" (cf. vs. 20: ὅπου κλέπται οὐ διορύσσουσιν οὐδὲ κλέπτουσιν). The author seems to have taken the word θησαυρός in the sense of treasury, as appears from the parallelism between θησαυρός and ἀποθήκη.

According to the *Authentikos Logos*, the soul hastens to heaven, into its treasure-house where its νοῦς is. We have already discussed the passage which says that the soul's heavenly bridegroom, i.e. the divine Noῦς, makes the νοῦς of the soul see through the Logos. It must have been this conception which induced the author to his allusion to Matth. 6,21: the soul ascends to heaven where its Noῦς and, therefore, also its θησαυρός is. This implies that the author had in mind the inversed version which we find in Clement of Alexandria and Macarius (ὅπου ὁ νοῦς..., ἐκεῖ ὁ θησαυρός). The form of the saying in Justin Martyr most probably represents an adaptation of the original inversed version to the canonical tradition.

The instances we have discussed show that the author of the *Authentikos Logos* knew the New Testament. The vagueness of his allusions suggest that he assumed his readers or, more probably, his original listeners to have an equal knowledge of the Scriptures. In reading his work one gets the impression that the author was a Christian but did not want to show that too openly. To this aspect we shall return at the end of this article.

2. *The eternal bliss of the soul*

The *Authentikos Logos* concludes with a description of the soul's final happiness: "It came to rest in him who is at rest. It reclined in the bride-chamber. It ate of the banquet for which it had hungered. It partook of the immortal food. It found what it had sought after. It received rest from its labors, while the light that shines forth upon it does not sink. To it belongs the glory and the power and the revelation for ever and ever. Amen" (35,9–22).

All elements of this description of the soul's eternal bliss are traditional motifs of Jewish and Christian eschatological imagery: the soul that rests from its labors (cf. Rev. 14,13: ἵνα ἀναπαύσωνται ἐκ τῶν κόπων αὐτῶν),[45] the light which does not sink (cf. Isaiah 60,19–20: ἔσται γὰρ κύριός σοι φῶς αἰώνιον, and Rev. 21,23), the heavenly banquet (cf. Isaiah 25,6, Luke 14,24, Rev. 19,9: μακάριοι οἱ εἰς τὸ δεῖπνον τοῦ γαμοῦ τοῦ ἀρνίου κεκλημένοι),[46] and the sacred marriage, which in Rev. 19,9 and in Matth. 22,2 ff. is combined with the image of the eschatological banquet.[47]

The idea of the sacred marriage played a considerable part in several Gnostic systems, particularly in Valentinianism, which developed the Sacrament of the Bridal Chamber. In the *Exposition* (*Exegesis*) *on the Soul*, the returning soul is married to its heavenly counterpart, which restores the original androgynous union.[48] The Gnostic character of the *Exegesis* is far from certain; in any case, the idea of the sacred marriage of the soul is not typically Gnostic. Especially in Syrian theology the theme of the heavenly Bridal Chamber took a prominent place. Bardaisan already taught that the soul comes from and after death returns to "the Bridal Chamber of Light".[49] An interesting combination of the images of the sacred marriage, the heavenly banquet and the light of God is found in the Hymn of the Daughter of Light in the *Acts of Thomas*. There it is said of the servants who attend at the sacred marriage of Wisdom and the Lord: "And they shall be at that marriage for which the princes assemble together, and shall linger over the feasting of which the eternal ones are accounted worthy, and they shall put on royal robes and be

arrayed in splended raiment, and both shall be in joy and exultation. And they shall glorify the Father of all, whose proud light they received and were enlightened by the vision of their Lord, whose ambrosial food they received, which has no deficiency at all, and they drank too of his wine which gives them neither thirst nor desire. And they glorified and praised, with the living Spirit, the Father of Truth and the Mother of Wisdom" (chap. 7).[50]

In the *Authentikos Logos* the same complex of eschatological images is used to describe the final bliss of the soul. The soul's Bridegroom is the divine Noῦς who already assisted it during its earthly existence through the Logos. The soul's reclining in the bridal chamber is an image of the union of the νοῦς of man with the Noῦς of God. According to Bardaisan, the soul ascends through the planetary spheres until it enters, as pure νοῦς, the "Bridal Chamber of Light". On this point the parallel with the *Authentikos Logos* is striking, though there are also important differences at other points.[51]

The idea of the marriage of the soul and Nous represents a spiritualization of the mythical conception of the ἱερὸς γάμος. To the author of the *Authentikos Logos* this idea seems to have meant more than a useful motif of traditional eschatology. It is in fact one of the central ideas of the treatise: the soul's Bridegroom is already introduced on the first page (22,23) and later on mention is made of the bridal garment which the soul wears in beauty of mind, not in fleshly pride (32,6). The idea of the sacred marriage of the soul and Nous fitted quite well into the traditional Christian eschatological imagery, but it seems to have had an independent existence and possibly derives from another source. In the collection of *Pythagorean Sentences*, which in a slightly different form was extensively used by Porphyry in writing to his wife Marcella, we find the same idea.[52] In Sentence 118 (Chadwick 94) it is said that the marriage of the soul to Nous is sacred and celebrated in the true light, whereas bodily union takes place through impurity and darkness: ψυχῆς γάμος ὁ πρὸς τὸν νοῦν ἱερός τε ἅμα καὶ ἐν φωτὶ ἀληθινῷ μυσταγωγούμενος · ὁ δὲ τῶν σωμάτων δι'ἀκαθαρσίας καὶ σκότους. It is not explicitly said that the νοῦς is the divine Mind but the reference to "the true light" and the word μυσταγωγούμενος strongly suggest the heavenly marriage. In any case, there must have been Neopythagoreans, men of the type of Numenius, with whom this idea did not meet with repulsion. We have to conclude that in the final passage of his work the author of the *Authentikos Logos* managed to put a non-biblical idea into the setting of a traditional Christian view of eschatological happiness.

The preceding discussion of some of the Platonic and Christian elements in the *Authentikos Logos* leads to conclusions which are of some importance for the history of both Platonism and Christianity. This new text presents a parallel for the distinction made by Porphyry, in his *De regressu animae*, between the *anima rationalis* (or *intellectualis*) and the *anima spiritalis*. Moreover, it mentions a third soul, the ψυχὴ ὑλική. An *anima materialis* is not mentioned by Porphyry and we have seen that also the term *anima spiritalis* is avoided in his other works as far as we know them, as was also done by his followers. The distinction between the rational, the spiritual, and the material soul was known to the Gnostic Theodotus (second half of the second century A.D.), who adapted this anthropology to his Gnostic presuppositions. It seems that Porphyry only temporarily and only partially made use of a psychological scheme which was already known in the second century A.D. His source might have been Numenius, who exercised a strong influence on his thinking.[53] In any case, Numenius taught the existence of a material soul in man, which came from matter and was opposed to the rational soul in man which came from God. For the author of the *Authentikos Logos* as for Numenius matter is the source of evil. Similar ideas were held by the Gnostic Basilides and his son Isidorus, who also taught the two opposed souls in man. The *Hieros Gamos* between the soul and Nous appears in the *Pythagorean Sentences*, which were already in circulation in the second century A.D. With respect to the purpose of the soul's descent, the manifestation of the Father's wealth and glory, we noted a striking parallel in Calvisius Taurus.

All this shows that parallels to the views of the *Authentikos Logos* are found in writers who flourished and works that were written in the second century A.D., more particularly in the second half of that century. The author shows himself to be well acquainted with the particular views of several Middle Platonic philosophers, whereas there is no trace of Plotinian influence. This suggests a date of composition which cannot have been too far removed from the end of the second century.

The Christian element of the *Authentikos Logos* is characterized by a certain vagueness and ambiguity which make it understandable that it has even been denied that the author was a Christian. The name of Christ is not mentioned and the New Testament is not cited as the decisive authority in spiritual matters, nor even as merely confirming the ideas of Greek philosophers.

If we look for parallels attention should be drawn to the *Sentences of*

Sextus, of which the Christian character has also been denied. The Church Father Jerome already expressed the opinion that the *Sentences*, which had been translated by his former friend Rufinus and attributed to the Roman bishop and martyr Xystus, were written by "a man without Christ and a heathen". He observed that the work says much of perfection in accordance with the doctrine of the Pythagoreans who make man equal to God and maintain that he is of God's substance, and that it does not contain any reference to the prophets, the patriarchs, the apostles, or Christ.[54] But nevertheless, the *Sentences* were written by a Christian, as was convincingly shown by Henry Chadwick.[55] They represent a moderate type of Encratism which is also taught in the *Authentikos Logos*.

A Coptic translation of the *Sentences of Sextus* is part of the Nag Hammadi Library (Cod. XII,1). The same collection contains another writing to which the *Authentikos Logos* has to be compared if we want to determine its spiritual background, viz. the *Teachings of Silvanus* (Cod. VII,4). The *Teachings* form an interesting specimen of the rare sapiential literature of the early Christians. The center of the author's belief is Christ, who is interpreted as the incarnate Wisdom of God, the divine Teacher who imparts saving knowledge to man. The work primarily aims at moral instruction of the believers and on this point it has much in common with the *Authentikos Logos* and the *Sentences of Sextus*. The same can be said of its more general philosophical ideas on God and the divine soul. The relationship between these three writings deserves a special investigation. The *Teachings of Silvanus* seem to be more "catholic" than the two other writings; it takes a position between the *Authentikos Logos* and the *Sentences* on one side and the works of Clement of Alexandria on the other. Ideas which were of central importance to the author of the *Authentikos Logos* were also known to "Silvanus", but he did not always attach to them much weight. This is best shown by the motif of the bridal chamber which is encountered on page 94 of the *Teachings of Silvanus*. The soul receives the advice "Turn toward the rational nature and cast from yourself the earth-begotten nature. O soul, persistent one, be sober and shake off your drunkenness, which is the work of ignorance. If you persist and live in the body you dwell in rusticity. When you entered into a bodily birth you were begotten. (But) you have come into being inside the bridal chamber and you have been illuminated by the Nous" (94,16–29).[56] The author opposes here the bodily birth to the divine origin of the soul, just as he previously opposed the rational nature to the material nature. The passage shows that he knew the con-

ception of the heavenly bridal chamber from which the soul has come and to which it is to return. But this idea is only referred to and not further developed; it seems to be a traditional motif, not an essential idea.

The *Authentikos Logos*, the *Sentences* and the *Teachings* are characterized by a great openness for Platonic and Neopythagorean ideas on God and the soul, which apparently were thought to be wholly compatible with Christian belief. They are witnesses of the same cultural and religious climate, most probably that of Alexandria about 200 A.D.[57]

That the *Authentikos Logos* originated in Alexandria is suggested by its theory of the Logos. The soul contemplates the invisible world through the Logos. The Bridegroom of the soul puts the Logos on its eyes as a medicament in order to make see it with its mind (22,20–34). But in 27, 27–32 and 28,10–13 it is the soul itself which puts the Logos on its eyes. The last-mentioned passage is of particular interest here: "Thus the soul takes (or: receives; the Coptic is ambiguous) a Logos every time to put it on its eyes as a medicament in order that it may see." Here the word Logos appears with the indefinite article. The assistance of the Logos in the struggle of man against matter apparently could be described as the help of a Logos. This doctrine of the Logos, which needs a thorough study, has to be interpreted in the light of Philo's allegorical speculations. Philo used to apply the term Logos to mind, also those minds or incorporeal souls which constitute the angels.[58] In his explanation of Jacob's dream he interpreted the angels who went up and down upon the ladder as Logoi: when they go up they take the soul with them on high, giving it to contemplate that which is only worth contemplating; when they go down it is for our aid and to join our fight and to give new life to the soul.[59] This view did not remain unnoticed in Alexandria. Hippolytus reports that the Valentinians taught that Sophia and Carpus, the common fruit of the Pleroma, generated seventy λόγους οἵτινές εἰσιν ἄγγελοι ἐπουράνιοι. These Logoi are sowed into the world and sometimes live in the earthly body of man together with the soul when there are no demons in it.[60] Marcus the Gnostic identified the aeons, which he also called Logoi, with the guardian angels "who constantly see the face of the Father" (Matth. 18,10).[61] This identification of the Logoi and the (guardian) angels must originate with Valentinus.

The view of the *Authentikos Logos* that the soul receives or takes a Logos which makes its mind see must be seen in the perspective of Philo's explanation of the angels as Logoi. Valentinus must have got acquainted with it in his native town Alexandria. It is conceivable that Philo's inter-

pretation of the angels was adopted by the Christian Platonists of Alexandria. In any case, the apparent relationship with Philonean ideas makes it highly probable that the *Authentikos Logos* was written in Alexandria and represents views which were current among the educated Christians of that city.

The *Authentikos Logos* shows, once again, that the Nag Hammadi Library is not only of interest for the history of Gnosticism. It is true, we now have more original Gnostic documents at our disposal than Irenaeus had in writing his *Adversus Haereses*. But the Nag Hammadi collection contains also writings which are not Gnostic at all but apparently enjoyed some popularity among the Gnostics. Works like the *Authentikos Logos*, the *Teachings of Silvanus*, and the *Sentences of Sextus*, which was already previously known in its original Greek form, reveal important aspects of Alexandrian Christianity before Clement.

There were not only Gnostics in Alexandria, nor only Gnostics and, in opposition to them, a group of faithful orthodox people who kept to the simple message of the Gospels. There were also non-Gnostic Christians who considered Christianity the true philosophy which to a very great extent could be expressed in Platonic or (which did not make much difference) in Neopythagorean terms. In the steps of Philo, the Bible was read in the light of the philosophy of the time; emphasis was laid on the rational aspect of man; the salvation of the soul was to be obtained through knowledge and continence; it is doubtful whether the belief in bodily resurrection was maintained. Works like the *Authentikos Logos* and the *Sentences of Sextus* show a certain deliberate vagueness with respect to their Christian inspiration.[62] In them Christ is not mentioned by name. The author of the *Authentikos Logos* most probably identified him with the soul's Bridegroom, the divine Nous. We have seen that even Saint Augustine had no difficulty in identifying the πατρικὸς νοῦς of Porphyry with Christ.

The works of these early Alexandrian Platonists were most probably considered unorthodox or at least not orthodox enough by later writers of the Church and, therefore, neglected. Only the *Sentences of Sextus* survived because of their admired ascetical maxims. There seems to have been in Alexandria a development to a more Bible- and Church-orientated, more "orthodox" theology, in which, however, the philosophical interpretation of Christianity remained predominant. This stage seems to have been reached with Clement and, more fully, with Origen. The *Authentikos Logos* represents a type of Alexandrian Christianity which preceded

the activity of Clement at the Alexandrian school. The work must have been written in the last decades of the second century A.D.

NOTES

[1] *The Facsimile Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices: Codex VI* (Leiden 1972) 26–39; M. Krause and P. Labib, *Gnostische und hermetische Schriften aus Codex II und Codex VI*, Abhandlungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts Kairo, Koptische Reihe, 2 (Glückstadt 1971) 133–149; J. E. Ménard, *L'Authentikos Logos*, Bibliothèque copte de Nag Hammadi, section: "Textes", 2 (Quebec 1977), with commentary; English translation by G. W. MacRae in *The Nag Hammadi Library in English*, edited by J. M. Robinson (Leiden 1977) 278–283; German translation by W.-P. Funk *et al.*, Authentikos Logos. Die dritte Schrift aus Nag-Hammadi-Codex VI, *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 98 (1973) 251–259. A first summary of the contents of this writing was given by M. Krause, Der Stand der Veröffentlichung der Nag Hammadi-Texte, in *Le Origini dello Gnosticismo*, Studies in the History of Religions, XII (Leiden 1967) 83–86, 88. Other studies: G. W. MacRae, A Nag Hammadi Tractate on the Soul, in *Ex Orbe Religionum* (Studia Geo Widengren oblata), I, Studies in the History of Religions, XXI (Leiden 1972) 471–479; C. Colpe, Heidnische, jüdische und christliche Überlieferung in den Schriften aus Nag Hammadi I, *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum* 15 (1972) 12–13.

[2] G. W. MacRae, in *The Nag Hammadi Library in English*, 278.

[3] Krause, Stand der Veröffentlichung, 83 (many Gnostic and Hermetic parallels; no Scriptural quotations); MacRae, A Nag Hammadi Tractate, 476–479 (not Christian, more Hermetic than Gnostic); Idem, in *The Nag Hammadi Library in English*, 278 (the work presupposes certain general Gnostic ideas; specifically Jewish or Christian themes cannot be identified with any degree of confidence or regularity); Colpe, *o.c.*, 12 (not wholly Gnostic, doctrine of the soul "hermetische Variante der Anthropos-Lehre der Naassener-Predigt"); Funk, *o.c.*, 253–254 (Gnostic, not Christian but indirect influences of Christian traditions possible); Ménard, *o.c.*, passim (Gnostic, not Christian).

[4] MacRae, A Nag Hammadi Tractate, 477; Ménard, *o.b.*, 3: "Il n'est philosophique ni dans son contenu ni dans sa terminologie" (omitting MacRae's "almost"!).

[5] The Coptic word *son* means "brother", only the plural *snèy* can also mean "sisters" (cf. W. E. Crum, *A Coptic Dictonary* (Oxford 1939) 342–343). But we may assume that in the original Greek the ψυχὴ πνευματική was called ἀδελφή of the passions mentioned. The Coptic must here be defective (or could *son* also mean "sister" and presents our text the first evidence of this meaning?).

[6] A study of this work and an edition of its fragments in J. Bidez, *Vie de Porphyre* (Ghent 1913; reprinted Hildesheim 1964) 88–97, 158–162, *27–*44. See also H. Lewy, *Chaldaean Oracles and Theurgy*, Recherches d'Archéologie, de Philologie et d'Histoire, 13 (Cairo 1956) 449–456; C. W. Wolfskeel, Ist Augustin in *De immortalitate animae* von der Gedankenwelt des Porphyrios beeinflusst worden?, *Vigiliae Christianae* 26 (1972) 130–145.

[7] Augustine, *De Civitate Dei*, 10,9 (frg. 2 Bidez); cf. 10,27 (frg. 3 Bidez): ... *intellectualem animam, hoc est mentem nostram ..., et ipsam spiritalem, id est nostrae animae partem mente inferiorem.*

[8] H. Dörrie, Die Lehre von der Seele, in *Porphyre*, Entretiens sur l'Antiquité Classique (Fondation Hardt), 12 (Geneva 1966) 182. *De regressu animae* dates from Porphyry's post-Plotinian period; it presents "eine Verschmelzung von plotinischer Mystik und 'chaldäischer' Theurgie" (J. H. Waszink, Porphyrios und Numenios, in *Porphyre*, 45; see also *ibid.* 64–65).

[9] *Sententiae*, 29 (Lambertz, 17 ff.).

[10] Cf. W. Lang, *Das Traumbuch des Synesius von Kyrene*, Heidelberger Abhandlungen zur Philosophie und ihrer Geschichte, 10 (Tübingen 1926) 60 ff.

[11] For this, see H. Dörrie, *Porphyrios' "Symmikta Zetemata"*, Zetemata. Monographien zur klassischen Altertumswissenschaft, 20 (Munich 1959) 198–221.

[12] Th. Kobusch, *Studien zur Philosophie des Hierokles von Alexandrien*, Epimeleia. Beiträge zur Philosophie, 27 (Munich 1976) 118–122; Ilsetraut Hadot, *Le problème du Néoplatonisme alexandrin: Hiéroclès et Simplicius* (Paris 1978) 98–106; cf. also A. Smith, *Porphyry's Place in the Neoplatonic Tradition. A Study in Post-Plotinian Neoplatonism* (The Hague 1974) 157.

[13] *Commentarius*, 16,11 (Koehler 74,6); the other expressions in chapter 26.

[14] The same view in the *Oracula Chaldaica*, frg. 61e (Des Places 82), which most probably influenced Porphyry; cf. O. Geudtner, *Die Seelenlehre der Chaldäischen Orakel*, Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie, 35 (Meisenheim am Glan 1971) 18–24. Also in Synesius, *De insomn.*, 7, 138B (Terzaghi 157, 8).

[15] There has been much debate on the question of whether Macrobius' descensus myth, through the intermediary of Porphyry, ultimately derives from Numenius. In my opinion, the recent studies of De Ley and Flamant have shown that the objections made against Leemans's attribution of the passage to Numenius are invalid. But that need not mean that Macrobius or Porphyry did not modify their source. So it may be doubted whether the gifts of the planetary spheres to the soul, as described by Macrobius, are compatible with the views of Numenius as we know them from other sources. For the whole question, see H. de Ley, *Macrobius and Numenius. A Study in Macrobius, In Somn. I, c.*12, Collection Latomus, 125 (Brussels 1972) and J. Flamant, *Macrobe et le Néo-Platonisme latin, à la fin du IV^e siècle*, Etudes préliminaires aux religions orientales dans l'Empire Romain, 58 (Leiden 1977) 540–565.

[16] Macrobius, *In somn.*, 1,11,12 (Willis II,47,25–29): *in singulis enim sphaeris quae caelo subiectae sunt aetheria obvolutione vestitur, ut per eas gradatim societati huius indumenti testei concilietur et ideo totidem mortibus quot sphaeris transit, ad hanc pervenit quae in terris vita vocitatur.*

[17] See E. R. Dodds, *Proclus. The Elements of Theology* (Oxford ²1963) 313–321; Smith, *o.c.* (see note 12), 152–158; A. Kehl, Gewand (der Seele), *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*, 10 (fasc. 78 and 79 [1978]), 955–962, 969.

[18] For this combination of the Platonic and the Aristotelian faculties of the soul, see Flamant, *o.c.*, 523–524. A positive view of the gifts of the spheres is also found in Aristides Quintilianus, *De musica*,2,17 (Winnington-Ingram 87,9ff.); in *Korè Kosmou*, 28–29 (Nock-Festugière IV, 8–9; cf. III, CXCIV–CXCVIII) the soul receives good and evil faculties from the planets.

[19] In the *Poimandres* (*Corp. Herm.* 1), 25 (Nock- Festugière I, 15) the vices are combined with vital faculties; a similar view in the interpolation in the *Testament of Ruben*, 2,3–3,2 (cf. 3,3–6: seven spirits of deceit are responsable for the passions in man; Charles 3–6). For the planetary vices in Gnosticism see W. Anz, *Zur Frage nach dem Ursprung des Gnostizismus*, Texte und Unters. zur Gesch. der altchr. Literatur, 15,4 (Leipzig 1897) passim, and W. Bousset, *Hauptprobleme der Gnosis*, Forsch. zur Rel. und Lit. des A. und N.T., 10 (Göttingen 1907; reprinted 1973) 361–369.

[20] Cf. also *Corp. Herm.*, 12,13 (Nock-Festugière I,179): ὁ γὰρ μακάριος θεὸς Ἀγαθὸς Δαίμων ψυχὴν μὲν ἐν σώματι ἔφη εἶναι, νοῦν δὲ ἐν ψυχῇ, λόγον δὲ ἐν τῷ νῷ, τὸν οὖν θεὸν τούτων πατέρα, and *Pythagorean Sentences*, 67 (Chadwick 89): νοῦ σῶμα ψυχὴν λογικὴν θετέον ἣν τρέφει ὁ νοῦς τῇ ἀρετῇ. The latter text was used by Porphyry, *Ad Marcellam*, 26 (Nauck 291)

[21] The starting point for this view was Plato's hypothesis in *Leg.*, 897b ff. It is also found in Plutarch and Atticus; for the difference between these authors and Numenius,

see Waszink's *Praefatio* to his edition of Calcidius, in *Plato Latinus* IV (London-Leiden 1962) LII.

[22] Iamblichus, in Stobaeus, *Eclog.*, 1,49,25a (Wachsmuth I,350–351) = frg. 44 Des Places = Test. 36 Leemans. For Numenius' doctrine of the soul, see R. Beutler, Numenios, in Pauly-Wissowa, *RE*, Suppl. VII (1940) 674–677; Waszink, Porphyrios und Numenios (see note 8), 76–77, and Idem, in the *Praefatio* to his edition of Calcidius, LV–LVIII; J. Dillon, *The Middle Platonists. A Study of Platonism*, 80 *B.C. to A.D.* 220 (London 1977) 374–378. Bardaisan also taught that the soul "derives from the Seven"; cf. H. J. W. Drijvers, *Bardaiṣan of Edessa*, Studia Semitica Neerlandica, 6 (Assen 1966) 132ff., and Idem, Bardaiṣan of Edessa and the Hermetica. The Aramaic Philosopher and the Philosophy of his Time, *Jaarbericht van het Vooraziatisch-Egyptisch Genootschap Ex Oriente Lux*, 21 (1969–1970) 192, 207–208, where the relationship between Numenius and Bardaisan is pointed out.

[23] Calcidius, *Comm. in Tim.*, 297 (Waszink 299,14): "Silua quae malorum fons est." Cf. Waszink, Porphyrios and Numenios (see note 8), 67–69.

[24] Iamblichus, in Stobaeus, *Eclog.*, 1,49,37 (Wachsmuth I,375) = frg. 43 Des Places = Test. 35 Leemans. For the origin of this idea, Waszink, Porphyrios und Numenios (see note 8), 41, refers to Albinus, *Didasc.*, 16,2.

[25] Calcidius, *Comm. in Tim.*, 297 (Waszink 300); cf. J. C. M. van Winden, *Calcidius on Matter. His Doctrine and Sources*, Philosophia Antiqua, 9 (Leiden 1959) 114.

[26] Iamblichus, *De mysteriis*, 8,6 (Des Places 199) reports that two souls in man were also taught in Hermetic writings, one soul coming from the First Intelligible, the other from the planetary spheres; see the literature mentioned by Des Places, 222.

[27] Thus Funk *c.s.* in their German translation (see note 1), 255.

[28] For the reference to Plato, see Waszink, *ad loc.*, 300, and Van Winden, *o.c.*, 115.

[29] Iamblichus, in Stobaeus, *Eclog.*, 1,49,37 (Wachsmuth I, 375) = frg. 43 Des Places = Test. 35 Leemans. Cf. A. J. Festugière, *La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste*, III (Paris 1953) 211, n.1; Waszink, Porphyrios und Numenios (see note 8), 69–72; Dörrie, Die Lehre von der Seele (see note 8), 178–182.

[30] MacRae, A Nag Hammadi Tractate on the Soul (see note 1), 474, 475.

[31] P. Courcelle, *Connais-toi toi-même de Socrate à Saint Bernard*, II (Paris 1975) 429–435.

[32] Translation by H. Bettenson, *Augustine. Concerning the City of God against the Pagans*, Pelican Classics (Harmondsworth 1972) 418. Augustine continues by saying that the idea of a permanent escape of the soul is a Porphyrian innovation: *Mundatam ab omnibus malis animam et cum Patre constitutam numquam iam mala mundi huius passuram esse confessus est.* For this, see Smith, *o.c.* (see note 12) ,36 and 56–61.

[33] Similar views on the purification of the psychic body in Hierocles of Alexandria, *Comm. in Carm. Aur.*, 26,8 (Koehler 11,6–8) and 27,3 (Koehler 120,3–8).

[34] Arnobius, *Adv. Nat.*, 2,33 (Marchesi 105): *Vos in aulam dominicam tamquam in propriam sedem remeaturos vos sponte nullo prohibente praesumitis*; Ibid., 2,62 (Marchesi 138): *aulam sibi eius patere, ac post hominis functionem prohibente se nullo tamquam in sedem referri patritam.* In 2,13 (Marchesi 81), Arnobius speaks in connexion with the *novi viri* about the performance of *secretarum artium ritus* in order to make certain powers propitious and to obtain that they do not put any hindrance in the soul's way back to its ancestral home (*neque ad sedes remeantibus patrias obstacula impeditionis opponant*); cf. also 2,66 (Marchesi 143). According to Courcelle, *o.c.* (see note 31), III, 625–637, the term *novi viri* indicates Porphyry and his school, their doctrine of salvation is that exposed in *De regressu animae*, and the theurgic practices mentioned by Arnobius are not to be associated with them.

[35] Plato, *Rep.*, 7,533d; cf. Kobusch, *o.c.* (see note 12), 129–130; Dörrie, Die Lehre von der Seele (see note 8), 169.

[36] Translation by M. L. Peel and J. Zandee in *The Nag Hammadi Library in English* (see note 1), 348. See also Clement of Alexandria, *Quis div. salv.*, 21,1 (Stählin III, 173,18); cf. J. Zandee, "*The Teachings of Silvanus*" *and Clement of Alexandria. A New Document of Alexandrian Theology*, Mededelingen en Verhandelingen van het Voor-aziatisch-Egyptisch Genootschap "Ex Oriente Lux", XIX (Leiden 1977) 13.

[37] The emphasis on the will of God as the decisive factor in the creation of the spiritual and the material world, whether through the intermediary of his Nous or Logos or not, is found in several authors of the second and third centuries A.D., e.g. Clement of Alexandria, *Protr.* 4,63,3 (Stählin I,48) and *Corp. Herm.*, 10,2 (Nock-Festugière I,113) and 13,21 (N.-F. II,209). Cf. Lewy, *o.c.* (see note 6), 329–332, and S. R. C. Lilla, *Clement of Alexandria. A Study in Christian Platonism and Gnosticism* (Oxford 1971) 224–226.

[38] Thus Dillon, *o.c.* (see note 22), 245.

[39] Cf. Festugière, *o.c.* (see note 29), 77: "Malgré de longues recherches, je n'ai pu trouver aucune parallèle à ce texte"; *Ibid.*, 219, n.6: "L'idée que le sage est un portrait de Dieu est ancienne et banale, mais je ne connais pas d'autre témoignage pour la doctrine que les âmes sont envoyées par les dieux sur la terre pour donner en spectacle la vie divine."

[40] See E. Bevan, *Holy Images. An Inquiry into Idolatry and Image-Worship in Ancient Paganism and in Christianity* (London 1940) 63–83, 108–109; Bidez, *o.c.* (see note 6) 98–102; and Oracle 13 of the *Tübingen Theosophy* (Erbse 169), which dates from the second century A.D. and was found engraved into the walls of the city of Oinoanda, cf. L. Robert, Un oracle gravé à Oinoanda, *Comptes Rendus (de l')Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* 1971 (Paris 1972) 597–619.

[41] In 34,18–22 this exhortation is repeated in the form of a quotation: "But to this senseless man the word has been preached, teaching him: 'Seek and inquire about the ways you should go'." The text continues with: "since there is nothing else which is as good as this", which seems a short comment of the author on the text he has just quoted. Most probably we have here a rather free quotation of Jeremiah 6,16: ἐρωτήσατε τρίβους κυρίου αἰωνίους καὶ ἴδετε, ποία ἐστὶν ἡ ὁδὸς ἡ ἀγαθή, καὶ βαδίζετε ἐν αὐτῇ. In the second century A.D. this text played a part in Christian polemics against Jews and Pagans, cf. Justin Martyr, *Dial.*, 123,4; Theophilus of Antioch, *Ad Autol.*, 3,12; Clement of Alexandria, *Paed.*, 1,93,1; *Strom.*, 5,8,2.

[42] I owe the reference to this text to Professor G. Quispel.

[43] See A. Resch, *Aussercanonische Paralleltexte zu den Evangelien*, II, Texte und Unters. zur Gesch. der altchr. Literatur, 10,3 (Leipzig 1895) 332–333, and G. Quispel, Das Hebräerevangelium im gnostischen Evangelium nach Maria, *Vigilae Christianae* 11 (1957) 139–144.

[44] Cf. E. Klostermann, *Das Marcusevangelium*, Handbuch zum N.T., 3 (Tübingen [4]1950) 127, and A.H. MacNeile, *The Gospel according to St. Matthew* (London 1938) 325. A similar substitution of νοῦς for καρδία was found in the introduction to the Eucharistic Prayer as used in the Antiochene Patriarchate; cf. C.A.Bouman, Variants in the Introduction to the Eucharistic Prayer, *Vigiliae Christianae* 4 (1953) 94–115; F. van de Paverd, *Zur Geschichte der Messliturgie in Antiocheia und Konstantinopel gegen Ende des vierten Jahrhunderts*, Orientalia Christiana Analecta, 187 (Rome 1970) 257–263, 472–473; also *Apocryphon of James* (Nag Hamm. Cod. I) 15,16 (Malinine, Puech, Quispel *et al.* 31 and 83 *ad loc.*

[45] Cf. *The Teachings of Silvanus* (Nag Hamm. Cod. VII), 103,15–17 (Peel and Zandee, see note 36, 354): "Walk in it (sc. the way of Christ) so that you may receive rest from your labors", and *The Book of Thomas the Contender* (Nag Hamm. Cod. II), 145, 12–14 (translation by J.D.Turner in *The Nag Hammadi Library in English*, see note 1,194): "For when you come forth from the sufferings and the passion of the body, you

will receive rest from the Good One." Both texts are not Gnostic.

[46] Cf. J. Behm, δεῖπνον, in *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum N.T.*, II (Stuttgart 1935) 33–35.

[47] Cf. E. Stauffer, γαμέω, in *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum N.T.*, I (Stuttgart 1933) 651–655.

[48] See now the translation by W. C. Robinson, Jr., in *The Nag Hammadi Library in English* (see note 1), 180–187.

[49] Cf. Drijvers, *Bardaiṣan of Edessa* (see note 22), 155, and *Idem*, Bardaiṣan of Edessa and the Hermetica, 205.

[50] I followed the translation in E. Hennecke-W. Schneemelcher, *New Testament Apocrypha*, II (London 1965) 446.

[51] See note 49. Bardaiṣan does not distinguish between the rational and the spiritual soul; his emphasis on the role of Fate and also his cosmology do not seem to be compatible with the views of the *Authentikos Logos*.

[52] Cf. H. Chadwick, *The Sentences of Sextus. A Contribution to the History of Early Christian Ethics*, Texts and Studies, New Series, V (Cambridge 1959) 138–162, and the notes to the text, 84–94. The relationship between the *Sentences of Sextus*, the *Pythagorean Sentences* and *Ad Marcellam* completely escaped the last editor and commentator of Porphyry's letter, W. Pötscher, *Porphyrios. Pros Markellan* (Leiden 1969).

[53] Proclus, *In Tim.*, I, 77, 22–24 Diehl (= Frg. 37 Des Places = Test. 49 Leemans): Πορφύριος, ὃν καὶ θαυμάσειεν ἄν τις εἰ ἕτερα λέγει τῆς Νουμηνίου παραδόσεως. Even if this remark has to be attributed to Iamblichus, who was ill-disposed towards Porphyry, it reveals that the latter owed very much to the Apamean philosopher; cf. Waszink, Porphyrios und Numenios (see note 8), 35–36.

[54] Jerome, *Epist.* 133,3 (CSEL 56, 246–247); cf. Chadwick, *o.c.*, 117–137.

[55] Chadwick, *o.c.*, 138–140, 159–162, and the notes to the text, 163–181.

[56] Peel and Zandee (see note 36), 351, translate 94,25–29 as follows: "When you had entered into a bodily birth, you were begotten. You have come into being inside the bridal chamber, and you have been illuminated in mind." The opposition between earthly birth and heavenly origin makes "by the Nous" as translation of *hm̄ pnous* preferable above "in mind" (moreover, if the latter was meant one would expect to read "in *your* mind").

[57] The *Sentences* are dated by Chadwick, *o.c.*, 159–160, "round about A.D. 180–210", and the *Teachings* by Peel and Zandee, *o.c.*, 347, "in the late second or early third century".

[58] Cf. H. A. Wolfson, *Philo. Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity and Islam*, I (Cambridge, Mass. ²1948) 376–377.

[59] Philo, *De somniis*, 1,147 (Cohn-Wendland III,236).

[60] Hippolytus, *Refut.*, 6,34,3 and 6 (Wendland 163). The views exposed in this passage represent a later stage of western Valentinianism; cf. W. Foerster, *Von Valentin zu Herakleon*, Beihefte zur ZNW, 7 (Giessen 1928) 57–58, 100, and F.-M.-M. Sagnard, *La Gnose Valentinienne et le témoignage de Saint Irénée*, Etudes de Philosophie Médiévale, 36 (Paris 1947) 234–237.

[61] Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.*, I,14,1–2 (Harvey I, 131–132); cf. Sagnard, *o.c.*, 431.

[62] Cf. Chadwick, *o.c.*, 138, concerning the *Sentences*: "But it is a striking fact that even where the Christian inspiration is most obvious the vocabulary and form are carefully touched up so as to bring it more into line with the style of the pagan maxims, mainly of Pythagorean origin. On the one hand, in content there is a Christianisation of pagan maxims; on the other hand, in form there is also a 'paganisation' of Christian maxims." The same can be said of the *Authentikos Logos*. See also Chadwick's remarks on the apologetic method of Origen, *o.c.*, 160.

Beusichem, Markt 17–19